

# **EXHIBIT E18**

Page 848

1 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
2 FOR THE COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT  
3

4 CARLA ALLEN,

5 Plaintiff,

6 vs.

7 Case. DR 180132

8 BRENNNTAG NORTH AMERICA, INC.,  
9 (sued individually and as  
successor-in-interest to MINERAL  
PIGMENT SOLUTIONS, INC., and as  
successor-in-interest to WHITACKER  
CLARK & DANIELS, INC.,) et al.,

10 Defendant.

11 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
12  
13

14 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
15 HAD BEFORE JUDGE TIMOTHY A. CANNING  
16 Volume V - pages 848 to 983  
17 Eureka, California  
18 Monday, October 1, 2018

19

20

21

22

23 Reported By:

24 LINDA VACCAREZZA, RPR, CLR, CRP, CSR. NO. 10201  
25 JOB NO. 148406

<p>1 2 3 4 5           October 1, 2018 6           9:49 a.m. 7 8 9           REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held at 10 Superior Court of California, County of Humboldt, 825 11 5th Street, Courtroom 1, Eureka, California, Before 12 Judge Timothy A. Canning, reported by Linda 13 Vaccarezza, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the 14 State of California. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>	<p>Page 849</p> <p>1           A P P E A R A N C E S: 2           KIRKLAND &amp; ELLIS 3           Attorneys for the Defendants Johnson &amp; 4           Johnson and Johnson &amp; Johnson Consumer, Inc. 5           333 South Hope Street 6           Los Angeles, California 90071 7           BY: KIMBERLY BRANSCOME, ESQ. 8           F. CHADWICK MORRISS, ESQ. 9           JAY BHIMANI, ESQ. 10          BENJAMIN SADUN, ESQ. 11 12 13 14 15 16          SIMON GREENSTONE PANATIER 17          Attorneys for the Plaintiff 18          1201 Elm Street 19          Dallas, Texas 75270 20          BY: DAVID GREENSTONE, ESQ. 21          CONOR NIDEFFER, ESQ. 22          LEAH KAGAN, ESQ. 23 24 25</p>
<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12          BARNES &amp; THORNBURG 13          Attorneys for CVS Pharmacy, Inc. 14          2019 Century Park East 15          Los Angeles, California 90067 16          BY: JAMES MURDICA, ESQ. 17          SANDRA KO, ESQ. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>	<p>Page 851</p> <p>1           APPEARANCES (CONT'D) 2           FOLEY &amp; MANFIELD 3           Attorneys for Colgate-Palmolive Company 4           300 South Grand Avenue 5           Los Angeles, California 90071 6           BY: LOUIS KLEIN, ESQ. 7           PETER MULARCZYK, ESQ. 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p>Page 852</p> <p>1           APPEARANCES: (CONT'D) 2           DENTONS 3           Attorneys for Imerys Talc America, Inc. 4           Spear Street Tower 5           One Market Plaza 6           San Francisco, California 94105 7           BY: MORDECAI BOONE, ESQ. 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Page 881</p> <p>1 attorney, can claim where these samples came from and 2 whether or not they are original product. That's an 3 overarching theme of the defense case.</p> <p>4 And so what we were -- what was taken away 5 from us is not only the opportunity to test in a 6 similar fashion as Dr. Longo did, which by the way, 7 Your Honor, when he was deposed he said that he 8 wouldn't expect Dr. Sanchez's laboratory to do any 9 different in terms of timing or do anything different 10 in terms of testing than what he did.</p> <p>11 It's the fact that we had our investigation 12 taken away from us. We lost two months of being able 13 to conduct any sort of the survey and discovery 14 request, conduct depositions in order to obtain 15 information about the providence of these samples. 16 And by the time that these samples were disclosed to 17 us, and when we got that letter, there was nothing 18 about these samples. It simply said we have samples, 19 come and get them.</p> <p>20 There was less than a week left before fact 21 discovery closed. I mean, our hands were completely 22 tied. There was nothing we could have done at that 23 point. And when we met and conferred with Simon &amp; 24 Greenstone and wrote them a letter two days after we 25 were made known about the existence of the samples and</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 882</p> <p>1 said, we know nothing about their condition, where 2 they came from, how they were collected and 3 transported, we got nothing in response. And saying 4 we will -- we'll comply with the experts discovery 5 deadline and we'll give you what you need 48 hours 6 before Dr. Longo's deposition. That wasn't the point. 7 The point was to find out how they got this 8 physical evidence, where it came from, and whether or 9 not we had an opportunity to conduct an investigation. 10 That's what was taken away from us.</p> <p>11 Had they provided a list as the Court 12 suggested in July in response to discovery, not only 13 the inspection demand but the request for admission, 14 saying that there were no unsealed containers, we 15 could have started that process. We would have 16 immediately started discovery request. We would have 17 immediately met and conferred with them about where 18 they got the samples and deposing those individuals. 19 That's what was taken away from us. That's the harm 20 here.</p> <p>21 THE COURT: I appreciate the argument. I 22 think I've probably heard enough at this point. And I 23 am concerned obviously about this giving Colgate 24 sufficient time to address the samples, at least the 25 existence of the samples. And I certainly understand</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 883</p> <p>1 Colgate's argument regarding doing additional 2 discovery to try to figure out where the samples came 3 from and what the history of those samples are.</p> <p>4 But at this point, what the Court will do is, 5 I'll leave my order in place for now, subject to 6 modification based on where things stands on the 15th.</p> <p>7 Again, my intention is not to punish the 8 plaintiff for failing to turn over the -- to disclose 9 the existence of those samples, but I also want to 10 address the prejudice that's causing the defendant 11 because, as I mentioned, I thought it was an abuse of 12 the discovery process, so as not disclose the 13 existence of those samples.</p> <p>14 So at this point the Court will leave the 15 order as previously stated, but I would, with the 16 permission to revisit those sanctions on the 15th.</p> <p>17 And so I guess returning back to the question 18 of scheduling. My intention, the Court's intention at 19 least, was that we would have a panel picked by the 20 end of this week and hopefully start with our openings 21 next week. But I haven't gotten an update yet as far 22 as where things stand downstairs as far as jury 23 selection.</p> <p>24 I do know that we lost a couple of jurors 25 over the weekend who essentially developed medical</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 884</p> <p>1 issues. And so we are now down to, I think it's 57 or 2 58 in our pool. And so it's one of the concerns that 3 the longer it takes to bring people up, we start 4 losing people. So hopefully we can start bringing 5 people on tomorrow, depending on how things go today.</p> <p>6 MR. MULARCZYK: Your Honor, I did have a 7 question. Once we have the number locked in, in terms 8 of group that's capping up, are we going to receive a 9 randomized list from the Court of who those jurors 10 will be, in terms of preparation?</p> <p>11 THE COURT: Yes. And we'll generate a 12 randomized list and we'll identify who will be the 13 first 16 that we call as well -- or first eight.</p> <p>14 MS. BRANSCOME: Would it be possible, Your 15 Honor, to find out which jurors have dropped out 16 already? Just so that we don't spend time preparing 17 voir dire for jurors that we know are not returning?</p> <p>18 THE COURT: Thank you, yes. And I can 19 certainly get that information for you over the lunch 20 hour.</p> <p>21 MS. BRANSCOME: Thank you.</p> <p>22 MR. MULARCZYK: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>23 MR. NIDEFFER: Your Honor, regarding the ex 24 parte that we filed this morning, this is in regards 25 to what happened on Friday with the request for a</p>

Page 885

1 leave to amend the complaint.

2 And we did reach an agreement over the  
3 weekend, once we gave the ex parte notice on Friday,  
4 for Tuesday, on a briefing schedule, shorter briefing  
5 schedule. So we have that. The motion was filed and  
6 served on all parties on Saturday before noon, was the  
7 agreement. The ex parte was served this morning. So  
8 what we're requesting, that the ex parte to be heard  
9 tomorrow morning.

10 It's just the Court's agreement to our  
11 shortened briefing schedule. The opposition is going  
12 to be filed by Tuesday morning at 9 a.m. And then the  
13 parties are willing to hear that tomorrow afternoon at  
14 1:30, as long as the Court is willing to hear that.

15 THE COURT: Is there any -- looks like this  
16 is a stipulation but I just wanted to check in with  
17 other counsel as far as any issues with the  
18 scheduling.

19 MS. BRANSCOME: That is the agreement with  
20 respect to the shortened briefing schedule. It was  
21 our possession this was not an appropriate motion,  
22 just ex parte, but we agreed to a shortened briefing  
23 schedule.

24 THE COURT: Thank you. So that is certainly  
25 acceptable to the Court. So for the motion to amend

Page 886

1 the complaint, we'll have opposition papers to be  
2 served tomorrow morning and then we'll have a hearing  
3 at 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.

4 MR. NIDEFFER: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: Do you have a time estimate as  
6 far as how long yours might take?

7 MR. NIDEFFER: I think our argument would  
8 probably be about 15 minutes, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: All right. Does defense counsel  
10 have an estimate?

11 MS. BRANSCOME: Ours might be a touch longer,  
12 Your Honor. There's some complex legal doctrine, but  
13 I would say 30 minutes or so.

14 THE COURT: All right. And just want to know  
15 in case we do start bringing jurors up tomorrow. And  
16 then we'll take a little extra longer lunch break in  
17 order to address the motion.

18 Then turning to the defendants Motions in  
19 Limine Number 1 -- I'm sorry, Number 5 and Number 4  
20 and Number 1. As far as defense Motion in Limine  
21 Number 1, the Court is going to deny that request.

22 It does appear to the Court that at least  
23 there's a sufficient basis for the experts to testify  
24 as to their testing of the samples themselves. Though  
25 there's a conflict as to what the appropriate

Page 887

1 definition of asbestos is, as well as the detection  
2 method for fibers as well as the methodology used for  
3 counting fibers. There's also issues raised as to the  
4 genuineness and authenticity of the contents of the  
5 container.

6 In the Court's view, those issues go to the  
7 weight of the results, not so much as to whether or  
8 not it's admissible or not. And so, in the Court's  
9 view those are issues that are appropriate for the  
10 jury to resolve.

11 And so the Court will permit the plaintiffs'  
12 expert to testify as to what they actually did, the  
13 description of the samples they tested, as well as why  
14 the procedures and methodology they employed  
15 adequately supports their conclusions about the  
16 samples.

17 Defendants can cross-examine and argue to the  
18 jury that the experts testimony should be either  
19 disregarded or not given much weight because of  
20 questions regarding the source or content of the  
21 samples as well as the methodology employed by  
22 plaintiffs' experts.

23 However the data they found supports their  
24 conclusions about those samples. But under the  
25 standard of Sargon, the Court does believe that that's

Page 888

1 a -- those are issues for the jury to decide not issue  
2 for the Court to decide.

3 MR. MULARCZYK: Your Honor, one point of  
4 clarification.

5 THE COURT: Certainly.

6 MR. MULARCZYK: So as I understand it, the  
7 plaintiffs will be limited in their ability to discuss  
8 samples that they actually personally tested. So the  
9 samples we sought to exclude are over 50 of them, by  
10 other experts that have been tested, they will not be  
11 able to discuss those.

12 THE COURT: If they use those as far as to  
13 support their conclusions, they can offer testimony  
14 about other examples -- or other samples that were  
15 tested. But as far as making the conclusions that  
16 those samples also contained asbestos, to the Court,  
17 that goes beyond what plaintiff's experts can testify  
18 to.

19 They can certainly testify as to what other  
20 information they used to rely on, to reach their  
21 conclusions about these samples -- the samples that  
22 they actually tested.

23 MR. MULARCZYK: So they can't talk about the  
24 results of the testing by the others?

25 THE COURT: They can talk about the

1 methodology, and the testing and so forth. But as far  
 2 as using that information to reach a conclusion that  
 3 therefore their samples also had asbestos, that's  
 4 beyond the scope of the expert testimony.

5 MR. GREENSTONE: So, for instance, Your  
 6 Honor, and I apologize.

7 THE COURT: Certainly. I would rather have  
 8 it clarified at this point and work out any issues.

9 MR. GREENSTONE: Right. So, for instance,  
 10 Dr. Compton and Dr. Longo, setting aside the Cashmere  
 11 Bouquet for a moment, Dr. Longo and Dr. Compton can  
 12 testify about the testing that they have done on the  
 13 samples that they tested and they can tell the jury  
 14 about those things?

15 THE COURT: That's correct, yes.

16 MR. GREENSTONE: And then as it relates to --  
 17 so the Court's ruling is then relating to them, then  
 18 talking, for instance, Dr. Compton saying, here's what  
 19 some other expert tested and here's what they found,  
 20 that's what you've limited?

21 THE COURT: Correct. They can talk about  
 22 other testing but not as far as the conclusion that  
 23 the talcum powder had asbestos.

24 MR. GREENSTONE: Okay.

25 THE COURT: If they are using the same

1 methodology to support what the testing methods were  
 2 that the plaintiff's experts used, they can testify,  
 3 for example, this is the same methodology used by  
 4 other experts.

5 As to the Motions in Limine Number 4 and  
 6 Number 5, the Court will deny those in part and grant  
 7 those in part.

8 In the Court's view, Dr. Longo Dr. Compton,  
 9 again, will be allowed to testify about the testing  
 10 that they did, the methodology that they used, the  
 11 data they collected from the samples that they tested.  
 12 They can also testify regarding their conclusions  
 13 about the samples that they tested.

14 However, the Court finds that there's not a  
 15 reasonable basis for Dr. Longo or Dr. Compton to opine  
 16 about asbestos in the entire product line throughout  
 17 the years that Ms. Allen used the products, or  
 18 specifically in the products that Ms. Allen actually  
 19 used.

20 The Court doesn't see that there's any  
 21 evidence that these two experts used any scientific  
 22 method or any mathematical method or any statistical  
 23 method in reaching their broad conclusions about the  
 24 products line or about the products that Ms. Allen  
 25 actually used.

1 To the Court's view, those opinions are based  
 2 on a leap of logic or conjecture. And quoting from  
 3 the case Sargon, S-A-R-G-O-N, quote, the Court may  
 4 conclude that there is simply too great an analytical  
 5 gap between the data and the opinion proffer, end  
 6 quote.

7 That was from Sargon versus U.S.C. (2012) 55  
 8 Cal. 4th 747, pages 771-772.

9 Similarly, the Court also stated in that  
 10 opinion that expert opinion is not admissible if it  
 11 consists of inferences and conclusions which can be  
 12 drawn as easily and intelligently by the trier of fact  
 13 as by the witness.

14 So here, the Court's view is that Dr. Compton  
 15 and Dr. Longo's opinion, or the presence of asbestos  
 16 in the entire talc line is not based on research or  
 17 scientific methodology, but instead is based on  
 18 inferences and conclusions about their product line  
 19 from the research on samples.

20 But there's no testimony, or at least no  
 21 evidence here, that the doctors used any type of  
 22 scientific methodology or mathematical analysis to  
 23 extrapolate from what they found in the samples to  
 24 what was contained in the entire product line.

25 Also there was some testimony I guess from a

1 -- that showed up in a report on samples from the  
 2 mines and the idea that the mines actually had  
 3 homogeneous population, or that the mines were  
 4 geologically homogeneous, but that doesn't translate  
 5 in this matter to being able to use the samples to  
 6 reach a conclusion about the entire mine. And  
 7 primarily because the samples themselves showed  
 8 variations as far as the number of asbestos fibers  
 9 that were in the mine samples.

10 Also, there's nothing in the expert's training  
 11 or background that suggest any expertise or  
 12 specialized knowledge or training in extrapolating  
 13 data from the samples to describe an entire  
 14 population.

15 And so the Court is going to grant the  
 16 Defendants Motion in Limine Number 4 in part, to  
 17 exclude Dr. Compton's testimony as to the following  
 18 opinions. This is excluding these opinions that the  
 19 talc plaintiff used contained asbestos, that all or  
 20 most of the talc from the argonaut mine contained  
 21 asbestos, that all or most of the talc from the  
 22 Italian mine contained asbestos, and all or most of  
 23 the talcum powder sold in the United States contained  
 24 asbestos.

25 So as to Number 5, the Court will exclude any

Page 893

1 testimony from Dr. Longo regarding follow-up opinions.  
 2 The talc plaintiffs used contained asbestos. All or  
 3 most of the talcum powder sold in the United States  
 4 contained asbestos as well as other opinions that  
 5 reach beyond the samples that Dr. Longo has tested.  
 6 And so as far as this is concerned, are there  
 7 any requests for clarification?  
 8 MR. MULARCZYK: Not from Colgate, Your Honor.  
 9 Thank you.  
 10 MS. BRANSCOME: Not from J & J. Thank you,  
 11 Your Honor.  
 12 THE COURT: Sure.  
 13 MR. GREENSTONE: But as it relates -- I do  
 14 want to clarify just one issue. As it relates to the  
 15 motion in limine relating to their -- the testing that  
 16 was done by Dr. Compton and Dr. Longo, the Court has  
 17 denied the motion in limine and allowed Dr. Compton  
 18 and Dr. Longo to come and testify about the  
 19 methodology and their own testing and the results? Am  
 20 I understanding that correctly?  
 21 THE COURT: That's correct, but not the next  
 22 step of saying that because of our results we believe  
 23 that all talc contained asbestos.  
 24 MR. GREENSTONE: I understand, Your Honor.  
 25 Thank you.

Page 894

1 THE COURT: Thank you.  
 2 And next then, we can move to the trial  
 3 preservation testimony by Dr. Cameron.  
 4 MR. MORRIS: Your Honor, with your  
 5 permission?  
 6 THE COURT: I believe we're ready to proceed,  
 7 yes.  
 8 MR. MORRIS: Chad Morris, on behalf of  
 9 Johnson & Johnson.  
 10 Your Honor, as you had stated, this hearing  
 11 is about line and page designations from Dr. Cameron's  
 12 deposition. And I think you've been provided with a  
 13 notebook that has the designated testimony. I did  
 14 want to point out one thing. I guess we tried to make  
 15 this probably as confusing for the Court as we  
 16 possibly could.  
 17 On every page where there is a designation  
 18 that may run ten or twelve pages, there will be an  
 19 objection on the top of each page. But not every  
 20 question and answer has been objected to. So you  
 21 really have to follow the chart that has the  
 22 designation by page and line number, and then the  
 23 objection besides it. And then there will be a place  
 24 for the Court's ruling.  
 25 I just didn't want to -- I was a little

Page 895

1 nervous the Court would be overwhelmed by the number  
 2 of stamped objections on every page and it's not as  
 3 voluminous as it would appear. And I think you will  
 4 have to follow that page and line number from the  
 5 objections.

6 THE COURT: Thank you.

7 MR. MORRIS: Just to set the stage, the Court  
 8 entered a ruling last week that portions of  
 9 Dr. Cameron's deposition exceeded the scope of  
 10 treatment and went into areas that would be beyond  
 11 what a treating physician would be able to testify  
 12 about.

13 Instead of trying to take on individual  
 14 questions and answers, for me it's -- I put it in  
 15 three buckets. And the objection would apply  
 16 basically similarly to every Q and A that's in that  
 17 bucket. The first one deals with Dr. Cameron's  
 18 testimony about pleural plaques. And that's found at  
 19 Pages 138 through Page 145.

20 And so to set the stage for that, we again go  
 21 to the discovery deposition where Dr. Cameron is asked  
 22 whether there are any radiographs, pathology, or other  
 23 testing that confirms the existing of pleural plaques.  
 24 And his answer is uh, no.

25 Dr. Cameron did not say he needed to look at

Page 896

1 other medical records. He did not say that he had  
 2 some vague recollection that there might have been  
 3 something he has seen in the past. So when we left  
 4 the discovery deposition, it was our understanding  
 5 that Dr. Cameron had no opinions that there was a  
 6 pleural plaque. That was consistent with what the  
 7 plaintiffs' expert Dr. Kradin had said 24 hours  
 8 earlier. And we certainly had no reason to think that  
 9 pleural plaques would be an issue when he came to  
 10 trial to testify.

11 So then we moved to the trial preservation  
 12 deposition and that's as if he would come in on  
 13 Wednesday of next week to testify in front of Your  
 14 Honor and the jury, and we had received no notice from  
 15 the plaintiff that Dr. Cameron had new opinions or  
 16 different opinions.

17 We had no notice whatsoever that he would  
 18 offer an opinion about pleural plaques until close to  
 19 the end of the deposition, plaintiff's counsel pulls  
 20 out a recorded that is not in Dr. Cameron's record  
 21 set. It's not a record that's part of the U.C.L.A.  
 22 file.

23 And they begin to lead him down a series of  
 24 questions:

25 Do you recall being asked about pleural

<p style="text-align: center;">Page 897</p> <p>1       plaques last week in your discovery deposition? He 2       says yes.</p> <p>3       Do you recall what you said? 4       He says yes. 5       What did you say? 6       And he then responded that he says he wanted 7       to look at the records. 8       But that's not what he said in the discovery 9       deposition. 10      He then says that he remembered that he 11     thought he saw a pathology or something like that 12     about a pleural plaque. He didn't say anything about 13     that in the discovery deposition. So what you have is 14     a physician who is a treating physician, being shown a 15     document that's not part of his file by the plaintiffs 16     lawyer, a complete surprise to the defendants. It's 17     not a U.C.L.A. record. It's a biopsy that's not a 18     procedure that Dr. Cameron performed. It's not a 19     procedure that anyone within his department or at 20     U.C.L.A. did. 21      And for the first time, he not only says 22     there is a pleural plaque, he then goes the next step 23     to say he has an opinion about that, and that it was 24     caused by exposure to asbestos. And our view, Your 25     Honor, is that this one goes well beyond the scope of</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 898</p> <p>1       treatment of a physician, Number 1. Both in the use 2       of a record brought to the deposition by the 3       plaintiffs lawyer. 4       And then, two, rendering an opinion about 5       that beyond his treatment of the plaintiff. And in 6       the briefing, Your Honor, for the original motion, we 7       cite to a case called Dozier versus Shapiro. And I 8       have an extra copy of that if Your Honor would like to 9       have a copy. 10      THE COURT: No thanks. I actually have easy 11     access to it. 12      MR. MORRIS: And so this is 199 Cal. App. 4th 13     1509. It's Dozier vs Shapiro. It's a medical 14     malpractice case, and a treating physician who was a 15     non-retained expert was deposed by the defendant. 16      Defendants counsel asked, do you have any 17     opinions about the standard of care that was given to 18     the plaintiff? 19      The treating physician responded that he 20     didn't have an opinion because he didn't have enough 21     information to formulate a view at that point. The 22     treating physician, again, a non-retained expert shows 23     up at trial and attempts to offer testimony that some 24     of the treatment performed by the defendant physician 25     had in fact breached the standard of care.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 899</p> <p>1       And the Court ruled that there is a time and 2       place where a physician sort of steps out of that 3       treating physician role and is treated like a retained 4       expert. And I think sort of a quote out of this case 5       from the Court is very, sort of illustrative of what 6       happened to us in this case. 7       The Court said that after a witness has 8       denied at his or her deposition having reached 9       opinions on a particular subject, the defendant is 10      entitled to rely on that disclaimer until such time as 11      appellate disclosed that the expert had conducted 12      further investigation, had reached additional opinions 13      in a new area of inquiry. 14      When counsel is not notified when the 15      opposing parties' expert witness formulate post 16      deposition opinions to be offered at trial, the 17      witness is in effect not made available for deposition 18      as to the further opinions. The very purpose of the 19      expert witness discovery statute is to give fair 20      notice of what an expert will say at trial. When an 21      expert is permitted to testify at trial on a wholly 22      undisclosed subject area, opposing parties lack a fair 23      opportunity to prepare for cross-examination or 24      rebuttal. 25      And that, Your Honor, is exactly what</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 900</p> <p>1       happened in this case. To our surprise, for the first 2       time we are now talking about a pleural plaque and it 3       was caused by asbestos. And the defense lawyers were 4       completely denied an opportunity to prepare for a 5       trial cross-examination at this deposition. 6       And based on that, Your Honor, we will ask 7       that the Court exclude the questions and answers 8       relating to the pleural plaque. 9       The second bucket -- 10      MR. GREENSTONE: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I 11      just thought perhaps that while we were talking 12      buckets, that I could respond to that before they 13      moved on to the next one, while the argument is still 14      fresh. 15      MR. MORRIS: Whatever the Court prefers is 16      fine with me. 17      THE COURT: If you don't mind, let's go ahead 18      and have a plaintiff's response to that. 19      MR. SHARP: Your Honor, I know I've been very 20      quiet. And I know you've been dying to hear from me. 21      Your Honor, Gary Sharp, on behalf of Colgate. The 22      only thing I would add to that is that it should be 23      excluded under Cameron. 24      And Number 2, the description in the biopsy 25      was a fibrous sclerotic plaque. That is a nonspecific</p>

Page 981	Page 982
1        THE COURT: Unless there's some reason to be 2        present. We certainly have the time, so if there's 3        something that we can address prior to the start of 4        voir dire?	1        talk about the rulings on the trial preservation for 2        Dr. Cameron, I don't think so.
5        MS. KO: Your honor, just to keep on the 6        radar that there is still a CVS motion in limine on 7        five newspaper articles but that hasn't been fully 8        briefed yet. We're still -- the plaintiffs are 9        intending, I understand, to file a written opposition 10      and we haven't seen that yet so it's not fully 11      briefed.	3        THE COURT: That's true. If you don't mind, 4        perhaps we can do that at 1:30 as well, or sometime 5        during the afternoon session.
12      I don't think we need to wait on voir dire -- 13      on that motion to start voir dire; I just wanted that 14      on the Court's radar.	6        MR. MULARCZYK: That's fine, that's fine. 7        THE COURT: So that's what we'll do then. 8        We'll set Wednesday for the start of voir dire and 9        tomorrow morning we won't have any session and then 10      we'll resume at 1:30 tomorrow afternoon.
15      And that was Number 30, I think?	11      (Time noted 2:34 p.m.)
16      MS. KO: Number 30, yes.	12
17      MS. BRANSCOME: And I would just say, Your 18      Honor, according to the agreed upon briefing schedule 19      we will be filing our opposition to the plaintiff's 20      motion for leave to amend the complaint by 9:00 a.m. 21      tomorrow so that will be something that will be coming 22      in before the 1:30 hearing, but I don't think there's 23      any other outstanding issues at least from J&J's 24      standpoint.	13
25      MR. MULARCZYK: Not unless the Court wants to	14
1        STATE OF CALIFORNIA ) 2                          ) ss. 3                          COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT )	15
4        I, LINDA VACCAREZZA, CSR NO. 10201, do 5        hereby certify that I am a Freelance Certified 6        Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California, 7        and that as such, I reported the proceedings had in 8        the above-entitled matter at the time and place set 9        forth herein;	16
10	17
11      I further certify that my stenotype notes 12      were thereafter transcribed by me, and that the 13      foregoing pages numbered 848 to 983, constitute a 14      full, true and correct transcription of my said 15      notes.	18
16      I declare under penalty of perjury under 17      the laws of the State of California that the foregoing 18      is true and correct.	19
19	20
20      DATED: 2nd day of October, 2018.	21
21	22
22	23
23      _____ 24      LINDA VACCAREZZA, CSR, RPR, CLR, CRP 25      License No. 10201	24
25	25

Page 983
1        STATE OF CALIFORNIA ) 2                          ) ss. 3                          COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT )
4        I, LINDA VACCAREZZA, CSR NO. 10201, do 5        hereby certify that I am a Freelance Certified 6        Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California, 7        and that as such, I reported the proceedings had in 8        the above-entitled matter at the time and place set 9        forth herein;
10
11      I further certify that my stenotype notes 12      were thereafter transcribed by me, and that the 13      foregoing pages numbered 848 to 983, constitute a 14      full, true and correct transcription of my said 15      notes.
16      I declare under penalty of perjury under 17      the laws of the State of California that the foregoing 18      is true and correct.
19
20      DATED: 2nd day of October, 2018.
21
22
23      _____ 24      LINDA VACCAREZZA, CSR, RPR, CLR, CRP 25      License No. 10201